S5 Table: Contextual factors influencing implementation interventions among the included studies.

Study author,	Contextual factors	
year		
Professional interventions		
Education		
Asch et al.,	Inner setting	
2005	• Leadership commitment: Participating organizations demonstrated leadership commitment through a \$125,000 contribution	
	• <i>Mandate</i> : Intervention use was not mandated; following the training session, each organization was free to apply any implementation intervention they saw fit	
Audit and Feed		
Kasje et al.,	Inner setting	
2006	• Culture: Most physicians were motivated to improve ACEI prescription	
	• Human factors: Educational intervention was integrated into regular work flow	
	Characteristics of individuals and teams	
	• Authority: Primary care physicians were hesitant to change treatment initiated by a cardiologist	
Cancian et al.,	Characteristics of individuals and teams	
2013	• Roles: Limited primary care nurses; physicians dealt with most HF patients independently	
Reminders		
Braun et al.,	Inner setting:	
2006	• <i>Teams, networks, and communications</i> : In practices following the medical care centre model, primary care physicians and specialists shared the same equipment and rooms which promoted collaboration	
	• Culture: Decision-making was considered a collaborative process	
Butler et al.,	Outer setting:	
2006	• External policy and incentives/disincentives: CMS was in the process of initiating public reporting of quality of care data	
	Inner setting:	
	• <i>Culture</i> : The research team was unable to effect cultural change to promote widespread adoption of the tool	
	• Mandate: Intervention use remained optional (not mandated) during the intervention phase	
	• Human factors: Intervention was designed to be unobtrusive	

Qian et al.,	Outer setting:	
2011		
2011	• External policy and incentives/disincentives: Reporting HF guideline-adherence data to TJC and CMS was	
	mandatory Inner setting:	
	Inner setting:	
C 1: 4 1	• Leadership commitment: Leaders were involved in intervention planning	
Gravelin et al.,	Outer setting:	
2011	• External policy and incentives/disincentives: CMS reimbursed hospitals and physicians for appropriate ICD implantations	
Professional in	terventions	
Changes in medical records systems		
Reingold et	Outer setting:	
al., 2007	• External policy and incentives/disincentives: Implementation of computerized physician order-entry system was	
	cited as a high national priority	
	Inner setting:	
	• Culture: Staff were committed to improving HF patient care	
	• Leadership commitment: Emergency Department and Quality Improvement chairs released memos to encourage	
	intervention use	
	• Measurement and data availability: The team collected data on utilization of the intervention throughout the	
	redesign process	
Oujiri et al.,	Outer setting:	
2011	• External policy and incentives/disincentives: TJC published performance measures for inpatient heart failure care	
	Inner setting:	
	• Mandate: Use of the implementation intervention was mandated for all hospital discharges	
	• <i>Culture</i> : The intervention was well-received throughout the institution	
Persell et	Inner setting:	
al.,2011	• Culture: Staff were motivated to improve HF care	
Clinical multid	isciplinary teams	
Mejhert et al.,	Characteristics of individuals and teams	
2004	• Authority: Nurses in program were allowed to institute and change the doses of medications	
Martinez et	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
al., 2013	• External policy and incentives/disincentives: CMS reduced reimbursement rates for hospitals with excessive HF	
	readmissions	
<u>l</u>		

Clinical pathways		
McCue et al.,	Outer setting:	
2009	• External policies and initiatives: TJC published performance measure for heart failure care	
Financial inter		
Provider incentives		
Esse et al.,	Outer setting:	
2013	• External policies and incentives: The intervention was initiated by Medicare Advantage Prescription Drug Plan	
Institutional incentives		
Lindenauer et	Outer setting:	
al., 2007	• External policies and incentives: The intervention was developed collaboratively by the American Hospital Association, Federation of American Hospitals, and Association of American Medical Colleges.	
Combined interventions		
Fonarow et	Inner setting:	
al., 2010	• Mandate: The use of provided resources was encouraged but not mandated; clinics were free to adopt/modify tools	
Gheorghiadem	to their discretion	
et al., 2012		
Goff et al.,	Outer setting:	
2005	• External policies and incentives: State-wide quality improvement project with external funding to implement and	
	evaluate the program	
Riggio et al.,	Inner Setting:	
2009	• <i>Leadership commitment</i> : Clinical Effectiveness Team that worked on developing the implementation intervention was chartered by the hospital's CEO and CMO	
	Outer setting:	
	• External policies and incentives: The Hospital Quality Initiative, launched by the US Department of Health and CMS, encouraged hospitals to report compliance with standardized performance measures. Better-performing hospitals were financially rewarded while poor performers were penalized. Hospitals in the study were at particular risk of financial penalty for non-compliance.	
Scott et al.,	Inner setting:	
2004	• Leadership commitment: Senior executives of state public health body were involved in the 2 year planning period	
	preceding the intervention phase	
	• Culture: Staff were motivated to improve HF	

CMS, Centre for Medicare and Medicaid Services; TJC, The Joint Commission; CEO, chief executive officer; CMO, chief medical officer